California Board of Registered Nursing

2011-2012 Annual School Report

Data Summary and Historical Trend Analysis

A Presentation of Pre-Licensure Nursing Education Programs in California

Los Angeles Area

May 18, 2013

Prepared by:
Alissa Totam, BS
Renae Waneka, MPH
Tim Bates, MPP
Joanne Spetz, PhD
University of California, San Francisco
3333 California Street, Suite 265
San Francisco, CA 94118

INTRODUCTION

Each year, the California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) requires all pre-licensure registered nursing programs in California to complete a survey detailing statistics of their programs, students and faculty. The survey collects data from August 1 through July 31. Information gathered from these surveys is compiled into a database and used to analyze trends in nursing education.

The BRN commissioned the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) to conduct a historical analysis of data collected from the 2001-2002 through the 2011-2012 survey. In this report, we present ten years of historical data from the BRN Annual School Survey. Data analyses were conducted statewide and for nine economic regions[1] in California, with a separate report for each region. All reports are available on the BRN website (http://www.rn.ca.gov/).

This report presents data from the Los Angeles Area, which includes Los Angeles and Ventura counties. All data are presented in aggregate form and describe overall trends in the areas and over the times specified and, therefore, may not be applicable to individual nursing education programs. Additional data from the past ten years of the BRN Annual School Survey are available in an interactive database on the BRN website.

Beginning with the 2011-2012 Annual School Survey, certain questions were revised to allow schools to report data separately for satellite campuses located in regions different from their home campus. This change was made to more accurately report student and faculty data by region, but it has the result that data which were previously reported in one region are now being reported in a different region. This is important because changes in regional totals that appear to signal either an increase or a decrease may in fact be the result of a program reporting satellite campus data in a different region. Data tables impacted by this change will be footnoted. In these instances, comparing 2011-2012 data to the previous year is not recommended. When regional totals include satellite campus data from a program whose home campus is located in a different region, it will be listed in Appendix A.

---

[1] The nine regions include: (1) Northern California, (2) Northern Sacramento Valley, (3) Greater Sacramento, (4) Bay Area, (5) San Joaquin Valley, (7) Central Coast, (8) Los Angeles Area (Los Angeles and Ventura counties), (9) Inland Empire (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties), and (10) Southern Border Region. Counties within each region are detailed in the corresponding regional report. The Central Sierra (Region 6) does not have any nursing education programs and was, therefore, not included in the analyses.

DATA SUMMARY AND HISTORICAL TREND ANALYSIS[2]

This analysis presents pre-licensure program data from the 2011-2012 BRN School Survey in comparison with data from previous years of the survey. Data items addressed include the number of nursing programs, enrollments, completions, retention rates, NCLEX pass rates, new graduate employment, student and faculty census data, the use of clinical simulation, availability of clinical space, and student clinical practice restrictions.

Trends in Pre-Licensure Nursing Programs

Number of Nursing Programs

In 2011-2012, the Los Angeles Area had a total of 41 pre-licensure nursing programs. This represents a net loss of one ADN program over the last year. Nursing programs in the region this year include 24 ADN programs, 10 BSN programs and 7 ELM programs. Three-quarters (75.6%) of all pre-licensure nursing programs in the Los Angeles Area are public. However, program growth in recent years has been driven by private schools.

Number of Nursing Programs

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Total Nursing Programs*	**28**	**31**	**31**	**34**	**39**	**39**	**40**	**40**	**42**	**41**
ADN	22	22	23	23	24	24	24	24	25	24
BSN	6	6	5	6	9	9	10	10	10	10
ELM		3	3	5	6	6	6	6	7	7
Public	23	24	24	27	31	31	31	31	31	31
Private	5	7	7	7	8	8	9	9	11	10
Total Number of Schools	27	29	29	30	35	35	36	35	37	37

*Some schools admit students in more than one program. The number of nursing programs may be greater than the number of nursing schools in the region.

The share of nursing programs that partner with another nursing school that offers a higher degree continued to increase. In 2011-2012, 31.7% (n=13) of Los Angeles Area nursing programs collaborated with another program that offered a higher degree than offered at their own program.

	Academic Year						
Partnerships*	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Schools that partner with another program that leads to a higher degree	2.9%	10.5%	5.3%	10.3%	12.5%	26.2%	31.7%
Total number of programs	34	38	38	39	40	42	41

*These data were collected for the first time in 2005-2006.

---

[2] 2011-2012 data may be influenced by satellite campus data being reported and allocated to their proper region for the first time in the 2011-2012 survey. Tables affected by this change are noted, and we caution the reader against comparing data collected in 2011-2012 with data collected in previous year's surveys.

Admission Spaces and New Student Enrollments

Pre-license nursing programs in the region reported a total of 3,596 spaces available for new students in 2011-2012. These spaces were filled with a total of 4,009 students, which represents the seventh consecutive year pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region enrolled more students than were spaces available. 36.6% (n=15) programs reporting that they filled more admission spaces than were available. The only reported reason for doing so was to account for attrition.

Availability and Utilization of Admission Spaces[†]

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Spaces Available	2,419	2,417	2,697	3,448	3,828	3,821	4,128	3,898	3,919	3,596
New Student Enrollments	2,341	2,397	2,660	3,773	4,313	4,189	4,506	4,441	4,261	4,009
% Spaces Filled	96.8%	99.2%	98.6%	109.4%	112.7%	109.6%	109.2%	113.9%	108.7%	111.5%

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region continue to receive more applications requesting entrance into their programs than can be accommodated. The increase in qualified applications, combined with the decrease in availability of space, is reflected in the 61.6% of qualified applications that were not accepted for admission in 2011-2012.

Student Admission Applications*[†]

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Qualified Applications	**4,005**	**5,026**	**4,734**	**8,380**	**7,963**	**9,183**	**10,187**	**11,284**	**10,737**	**10,446**
Accepted	2,341	2,397	2,660	3,773	4,313	4,189	4,506	4,441	4,261	4,009
Not Accepted	1,664	2,629	2,074	4,607	3,650	4,994	5,681	6,843	6,476	6,437
% Qualified Applications *Not* Accepted	41.5%	52.3%	43.8%	55.0%	45.8%	54.4%	55.8%	60.6%	60.3%	61.6%

*These data represent applications, not individuals. A change in the number of applications may not represent an equivalent change in the number of individuals applying to nursing school.

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region enrolled 4,009 new students in 2011-2012. The distribution of new enrollments by program type was 60.4% ADN (n=2,422), 32.2% BSN (n=1,291), and 7.4% ELM (n=296). New student enrollment among the region's public programs accounted for 68.4% (n=2,742) of the total new student enrollments in 2011-2012.

New Student Enrollment by Program Type[†]

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
New Student Enrollment	**2,341**	**2,397**	**2,660**	**3,773**	**4,313**	**4,189**	**4,506**	**4,441**	**4,261**	**4,009**
ADN	1,995	1,994	2,059	2,991	3,417	3,223	3,407	2,823	2,604	2,422
BSN	346	386	520	610	610	701	802	1,293	1,248	1,291
ELM		17	81	172	286	265	297	325	409	296
Private	264	295	523	750	794	890	1,128	1,329	1,372	1,267
Public	2,077	2,102	2,137	3,023	3,519	3,299	3,378	3,112	2,889	2,742

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Student Census Data

A total of 7,531 students were enrolled in one of the region's pre-license nursing programs as of October 15, 2012. The 2012 census indicates that 51.9% (n=3,912) of students were enrolled in an ADN program, 40.3% (n=3,033) in a BSN program, and 7.8% (n=586) in an ELM program.

Student Census Data*[†]

	Year									
Program Type	*2003*	*2004*	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*	*2011*	*2012*
ADN	3,491	3,527	4,078	4,696	5,313	5,253	5,202	4,620	4,398	3,912
BSN	1,009	1,095	1,290	1,349	1,269	1,642	1,859	2,478	2,985	3,033
ELM		278	148	302	466	479	470	544	693	586
Total Nursing Students	**4,500**	**4,900**	**5,516**	**6,347**	**7,048**	**7,374**	**7,531**	**7,642**	**8,076**	**7,531**

*Census data represent the number of students on October 15th of the given year

[†]2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Student Completions

Program completions at Los Angeles pre-license nursing programs totaled 3,110 in 2011-2012. The distribution of completions by program type was 63.8% ADN (n=1,983), 27.9% BSN (n=869), and 8.3% ELM (n=258).

Student Completions[†]

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	*2003-2004*	*2004-2005*	*2005-2006*	*2006-2007*	*2007-2008*	*2008-2009*	*2009-2010*	*2010-2011*	*2011-2012*
Student Completions	**1,735**	**1,839**	**1,826**	**2,277**	**2,647**	**2,854**	**3,151**	**3,429**	**2,977**	**3,110**
ADN	1,391	1,520	1,467	1,789	2,029	2,193	2,362	2,524	1,979	1,983
BSN	344	319	359	421	523	421	507	613	677	869
ELM		0	0	67	95	240	282	292	321	258

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Retention and Attrition Rates

Of the 2,850 students scheduled to complete a Los Angeles Area nursing program in the 2011-2012 academic year, 71.9% (n=2,050) completed the program on-time, 9.1% (n=258) are still enrolled in the program, and 19.0% (n=542) dropped out or were disqualified from the program.

Student Retention and Attrition[†]

	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	*2003-2004*	*2004-2005*	*2005-2006*	*2006-2007*	*2007-2008*	*2008-2009*	*2009-2010*	*2010-2011*	*2011-2012*
Students Scheduled to Complete the Program	**2,447**	**2,699**	**2,481**	**2,531**	**2,899**	**3,204**	**3,481**	**3,213**	**3,038**	**2,850**
Completed On Time	1,557	1,674	1,603	1,672	1,917	2,206	2,525	2,394	2,228	2,050
Still Enrolled	395	505	243	418	461	397	337	284	249	258
Attrition	495	520	635	441	521	601	619	535	561	542
Completed Late[‡]								231	156	152
Retention Rate*	63.6%	62.0%	64.6%	66.1%	66.1%	68.9%	72.5%	74.5%	73.3%	71.9%
Attrition Rate**	20.2%	19.3%	25.6%	17.4%	18.0%	18.8%	17.8%	16.7%	18.5%	19.0%
% Still Enrolled	16.1%	18.7%	9.8%	16.5%	15.9%	12.4%	9.7%	8.8%	8.2%	9.1%

[†]2011-2012 includes data reported for satellite campuses

[‡]Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey. These completions are not included in the calculation of either the retention or attrition rates.

*Retention rate = (students completing program on-time)/(students scheduled to complete)

**Attrition rate = (students dropped or disqualified who were scheduled to complete)/(students scheduled to complete)

Note: Blank cells indicate the information was not requested in the given year.

Attrition rates among the region's pre-license nursing programs vary by program type. Average rates in the region are lowest among ELM programs (8.1%) and highest among ADN programs (23.3%), and are also lower among private programs (6.2%) compared to public programs (21.2%).

Attrition Rates by Program Type*†

	Academic Year									
Program Type	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
ADN	22.4%	20.2%	28.9%	18.5%	21.7%	22.3%	21.5%	20.5%	23.4%	23.3%
BSN	8.7%	14.4%	9.3%	12.4%	3.9%	4.9%	6.6%	7.3%	8.4%	8.6%
ELM				8.3%	3.4%	4.5%	3.0%	3.3%	4.6%	8.1%
Private	10.5%	18.9%	16.4%	20.3%	2.5%	6.7%	6.0%	3.7%	5.1%	6.2%
Public	21.7%	19.3%	26.9%	17.1%	21.0%	21.9%	21.1%	18.8%	21.1%	21.2%

*Changes to the survey that occurred between 2003-2004 and 2005-2006 may have affected the comparability of these data over time.

†2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

Retention and Attrition Rates for Accelerated Programs

In 2011-2012, for the first time since these data have been collected, the region's average attrition rate as well as the share of students still enrolled in an accelerated program was 0%.

Student Retention and Attrition for Accelerated Programs*†

	Academic Year				
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Students Scheduled to Complete the Program	**146**	**82**	**114**	**154**	**130**
Completed On Time	129	74	100	111	130
Still Enrolled	5	0	1	24	0
Attrition	17	8	13	19	0
Completed Late‡			8	0	4
Retention Rate**	88.4%	90.2%	87.7%	72.1%	100%
Attrition Rate***	11.6%	9.8%	11.4%	12.3%	0%
% Still Enrolled	3.4%	0%	0.9%	15.6%	0%

*Retention and attrition data for accelerated programs were collected for the first time in 2007-2008.

†2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region.

‡Data were collected for the first time in 2009-2010 survey. These completions are not included in the calculation of either the retention or attrition rates.

**Retention rate = (students completing program on-time)/(students scheduled to complete)

***Attrition rate = (students dropped or disqualified who were scheduled to complete)/(students scheduled to complete)

Note: Blank cells indicated that the applicable information was not requested in the given year.

NCLEX Pass Rates

Overall, NCLEX pass rates for ADN and BSN program graduates in the Los Angeles region have improved in the last ten years. Pass rates for graduates of the region's ELM programs since 2007-2008 have fluctuated within a narrow range. In 2011-2012, the NCLEX pass rates by program type were 90.4% for ADN graduates, 88.9% for BSN graduates, and 88.1% for ELM graduates.

First Time NCLEX Pass Rates*[†]

Program	Academic Year									
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
ADN	82.3%	84.7%	83.2%	83.5%	85.8%	85.6%	88.4%	89.4%	89.3%	90.4%
BSN	86.4%	90.3%	83.8%	84.1%	88.7%	86.0%	89.9%	89.5%	87.2%	88.9%
ELM				92.3%	79.4%	89.8%	89.8%	87.9%	87.7%	88.1%
Accelerated Programs**						91.7%	95.5%	84.1%	96.6%	88.4%

*NCLEX pass rates for students who took the exam for the first time in the past five years.

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

** These data were collected for the first time in 2007-2008.

Employment of Recent Nursing Program Graduates[3]

As with other regions, hospitals represent the most frequently reported employment setting for recent graduates of pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region. In 2011-2012, the region's programs reported that 66.3% employed recent graduates were working in a hospital setting. Programs also reported that 15.6% of recent graduates had not found employment in nursing at the time of the survey. The 2011-2012 average regional share of new graduates employed in nursing in California was 70.1%.

Employment of Recent Nursing Program Graduates[†]

Employment Location	Academic Year							
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Hospital	71.8%	75.6%	85.6%	93.5%	81.5%	59.4%	56.6%	66.3%
Long-term care facilities	0.5%	1.5%	9.6%	1.2%	5.9%	7.4%	5.0%	5.7%
Community/public health facilities	1.2%	1.1%	4.7%	1.9%	7.1%	3.4%	5.8%	3.2%
Other healthcare facilities	1.5%	1.6%	3.6%	1.7%	6.3%	4.6%	3.6%	5.3%
Other	6.5%	20.2%	6.4%	1.7%	11.1%	16.1%	8.0%	3.8%
Unable to find employment*						31.2%	21.6%	15.6%
In California	57.3%	70.5%	91.3%	91.6%	87.6%	80.7%	64.1%	70.1%

[†]2011-2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region

*Data were added to the survey in 2009-2010

Note: Blank cells indicate the information was not requested in the given year

---

[3] Graduates whose employment setting was reported as "unknown" have been excluded from this table. In 2011-2012, on average, the employment setting was unknown for 19% of recent graduates.

Clinical Simulation in Nursing Education

Between 8/1/11 and 7/31/12, 97.3% (n=36) of the 37 nursing schools in the Los Angeles Area reported using clinical simulation[4], and one school plans to start using it next year. The most frequently reported reasons for why schools in the region used a clinical simulation center in 2011-2012 were to standardize clinical experiences, to provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting, and to check clinical competencies. Of the 36 schools that used clinical simulation centers in 2011-2012, 77.8% (n=28) plan to expand the center.

Reasons for Using a Clinical Simulation Center*

Reason	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
To standardize clinical experiences	64.3%	75.9%	70.0%	96.6%	94.4%
To provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting	64.3%	55.2%	80.0%	75.9%	69.4%
To check clinical competencies	78.6%	86.2%	80.0%	75.9%	80.6%
To make up for clinical experiences	42.9%	55.2%	70.0%	48.3%	50.0%
To increase capacity in your nursing program	21.4%	17.2%	10.0%	6.9%	5.6%
Number of schools that use a clinical simulation center	14	29	30	29	36

*These data were collected for the first time in 2006-2007. However, changes in these questions for the 2007-2008 administration of the survey and lack of confidence in the reliability of the 2006-2007 data prevent comparability of the data. Therefore, data prior to 2007-2008 are not shown.

Clinical Space & Clinical Practice Restrictions[5]

The number of Los Angeles Area nursing programs that reported that they were denied access to a clinical placement, unit or shift increased from 26 programs in 2010-2011 to 30 programs in 2011-2012. More than half (58.5%, n=24) of RN programs in the Los Angeles Area reported being denied access to a clinical placement in 2011-2012, while 43.9% (n=18) of programs were denied access to clinical units and only 26.8% (n=11) were denied access to a clinical shift during the same time period. Only 37.5% of the programs that were denied access to clinical placements were offered an alternative by the clinical site, while the majority of programs that were denied access to units or shifts were offered an alternative (55.6% and 81.8%, respectively). The lack of access to clinical space resulted in a loss of 45 clinical placements, 33 units and 22 shifts, which affected 334 students.[6]

---

[4] Clinical simulation provides a simulated real-time nursing care experience using clinical scenarios and low to hi-fidelity mannequins, which allow students to integrate, apply, and refine specific skills and abilities that are based on theoretical concepts and scientific knowledge. It may include videotaping, de-briefing and dialogue as part of the learning process.
[5] Some of these data were collected for the first time in 2009-2010. However, changes in these questions for the 2010-2011 administration of the survey prevent comparability of the data. Therefore, data prior to 2010-2011 are not shown.
[6] Only 18 of the 30 programs that reported experiencing a loss of clinical placements, units, or shifts also reported the total number of students affected by the loss.

Denied Clinical Space	2010-11	2011-12
Programs Denied Clinical Placement	19	24
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	4	9
Placements Lost	62	45
Number of programs that reported	40	40
Programs Denied Clinical Unit	23	18
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	16	10
Units Lost	41	33
Number of programs that reported	40	40
Programs Denied Clinical Shift	13	11
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	10	9
Shifts Lost	26	22
Number of programs that reported	39	40
Total number of students affected	564	334

Overall, competition for space arising from an increase in the number of nursing students was the most frequently reported reason why Los Angeles Area programs were denied clinical space, though the share of programs citing it as a reason declined compared to the previous year.

Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable*	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Competition for clinical space due to increase in number of nursing students in region	63.0%	61.5%	50.0%
Displaced by another program	55.6%	42.3%	36.7%
Decrease in patient census	33.3%	34.6%	33.3%
Staff nurse overload or insufficient qualified staff	48.2%	34.6%	43.3%
Closure, or partial closure, of clinical facility		26.9%	30.0%
Nurse residency programs	37.0%	26.9%	23.3%
No longer accepting ADN students	22.2%	19.2%	16.7%
Change in facility ownership/management		11.5%	13.3%
Clinical facility seeking magnet status	29.6%	0%	16.7%
Other	29.6%	15.4%	13.3%
Number of programs that reported	27	26	30

*Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 survey.

Note: Blank cells indicate that the applicable information was not requested in the given year.

In 2011-2012, the predominant reason for unavailable clinical space in both ADN and ELM programs was increased competition due to more nursing students in the region. BSN programs reported reasons relating to nurse residency programs as the major cause of unavailable clinical space. Staff nurse overload was reported as a significant issue for all three programs and ADN programs also reported displacement by another program as an important factor for space being unavailable.

Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable, by Program Type, 2011-2012

	Program Type			
Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable	ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Competition for clinical space due to increase in number of nursing students in region	55.0%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%
Displaced by another program	45.0%	16.7%	25.0%	36.7%
Decrease in patient census	30.0%	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
Staff nurse overload or insufficient qualified staff	40.0%	50.0%	50.0%	43.3%
Closure, or partial closure, of clinical facility	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	30.0%
Nurse residency programs	10.0%	66.7%	25.0%	23.3%
No longer accepting ADN students	25.0%	0%	0%	16.7%
Change in facility ownership/management	10.0%	33.3%	0%	13.3%
Clinical facility seeking magnet status	20.0%	0%	25.0%	16.7%
Other	5.0%	33.3%	25.0%	13.3%
Number of programs that reported	20	6	4	30

Programs that lost access to clinical space were asked to report on the strategies used to cover the lost placements, sites, or shifts. The most frequently reported strategy (60%) was to replace the lost clinical space at a different site currently being used by the program same clinical site. 40% of programs reported being able to replace lost space at the same site, and 40% by adding a new clinical site.

Strategies to Address the Loss of Clinical Space, 2011-2012*

Strategy to Address Lost Clinical Space	2011-12
Replaced lost space at different site currently used by nursing program	60.0%
Replaced lost space at same clinical site	40.0%
Added/replaced lost space with new site	40.0%
Clinical simulation	13.3%
Reduced student admissions	10.0%
Other	13.3%
Number of programs that reported	30

*Data were collected for the first time during the 2011-2012 survey.

34.1% (n=14) of nursing programs in the Los Angeles Area reported an increase in out-of-hospital clinical placements in 2011-2012. Public health agencies, skilled nursing facilities, and school health services were the most frequently reported alternative sites. The number of programs reporting school health services as an alternative to hospital placements increased by 24.7% in 2011-2012 compared to the previous year. Similarly, the share of programs reporting alternative placements in a medical practice, clinic, or physician's office in 2011-2012 approximately doubled over the prior year.

Alternative Clinical Sites*	2010-11	2011-12
Public health or community health agency	54.5%	42.9%
Skilled nursing/rehabilitation facility	45.5%	42.9%
Home health agency/home health service	36.4%	28.6%
Outpatient mental health/substance abuse	27.3%	28.6%
Surgery center/ambulatory care center	27.3%	21.4%
Urgent care, not hospital-based	27.3%	28.6%
School health service (K-12 or college)	18.2%	42.9%
Hospice	18.2%	21.4%
Medical practice, clinic, physician office	18.2%	35.7%
Case management/disease management	9.1%	14.3%
Occupational health or employee health service	9.1%	21.4%
Correctional facility, prison or jail	0%	0%
Renal dialysis unit	0%	0%
Number of programs that reported	11	14

*Data collected for the first time in 2010-2011

75.7% (n=28) of Los Angeles Area schools reported that pre-licensure students in their programs had encountered restrictions to clinical practice imposed on them by clinical facilities. The most common types of restricted access students faced were to the clinical site itself, due to a visit from accrediting agency, access to bar coding medication administration, and to electronic medical records. Schools reported that it was uncommon to have students face restrictions on direct communication with health care team members, glucometers, and access to alternative settings due to liability issues.

Common Types of Restricted Access for RN Students	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Clinical site due to visit from accrediting agency (Joint Commission)	63.0%	70.8%	75.0%
Bar coding medication administration	77.8%	54.2%	64.3%
Electronic Medical Records	74.1%	41.7%	64.3%
Student health and safety requirements		37.5%	50.0%
Automated medical supply cabinets	51.9%	29.2%	32.1%
IV medication administration	29.6%	29.2%	42.9%
Some patients due to staff workload		16.7%	25.0%
Alternative setting due to liability	25.9%	12.5%	25.0%
Glucometers	29.6%	12.5%	25.0%
Direct communication with health team	11.1%	0%	17.9%
Number of schools that reported	27	24	28

Note: Blank cells indicated that the applicable information was not requested in the given year.

Faculty Census Data[7]

On October 15, 2012, there were 1,076 total nursing faculty[8] at pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region, 40.4% (n=435) were full-time and 59.6% (n=641) were part-time. The need for faculty continues to outpace the number of active faculty. On October 15, 2012, there were 73 vacant faculty positions in the region, which represents a 6.4% faculty vacancy rate.

Faculty Census Data[†]

	Year									
	2003	*2004*	*2005**	*2006*	*2007**	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*	*2011*	*2012*
Total Faculty	**592**	**649**	**657**	**846**	**990**	**944**	**1,041**	**1,015**	**1,103**	**1,076**
Full-time	332	310	250	344	387	389	427	398	450	435
Part-time	260	339	317	502	593	555	614	617	653	641
Vacancy Rate**	**8.4%**	**3.9%**	**8.9%**	**6.8%**	**7.3%**	**6.6%**	**4.4%**	**5.9%**	**5.8%**	**6.4%**
Vacancies	54	26	64	62	78	67	48	64	68	73

[†]2012 data may be influenced by the allocation of satellite campus data to another region
*The sum of full- and part-time faculty did not equal the total faculty reported in these years.
**Vacancy rate = number of vacancies/(total faculty + number of vacancies)

In 2011-2012, 26 of 37 schools (70.3%) of Los Angeles Area nursing schools reported that faculty in their programs work an overloaded schedules. Almost all schools that have overloaded faculty pay extra for the overloaded schedule. In 2011-2012, 26 schools reported that their faculty work an overloaded schedule, and 96.2% (n=25) of these schools pay the faculty extra for the overloaded schedule.

	Academic Year			
Overloaded Schedules for Faculty*	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Schools with overloaded faculty	23	25	24	26
Share of schools that pay faculty extra for the overload	95.7%	92.0%	95.8%	96.2%
Total number of schools	36	34	37	37

*These data were collected for the first time in 2008-09.

---

[7] Census data represent the number of faculty on October 15th of the given year.
[8] Since faculty may work at more than one school, the number of faculty reported may be greater than the actual number of individuals who serve as faculty in nursing schools in the region.

Summary

Over the past decade, the number of Los Angeles Area pre-licensure nursing programs has grown from 28 programs in 2002-2003 to 41 programs in 2011-2012. Since 2007-2008, the share of nursing programs that partner with other schools that offer programs that lead to a higher degree has increased from 2.9% to 31.7%.

As a result of the increasing number of pre-license nursing programs in the region, new student enrollments have also nearly doubled. However, available space continues to be less than the number of students enrolling in the region's programs. In 2011-2012, 4,009 new students enrolled in programs that had only 3,596 available spaces. This marks the seventh consecutive year in which programs overenrolled students. Similarly, qualified applications to the region's nursing programs continued to outpace program capacity. In 2011-2012, regional programs received 10,446 qualified applications, 61.6% of which were not accepted for admission.

Pre-license nursing programs in the Los Angeles region reported 3,110 completions, almost double the 1,735 completions reported in 2002-2003. If retention rates remain at current levels, and if new student enrollments decline from their current level, the annual number of graduates from the region's nursing programs would also decline in future years. At the time of the survey, approximately 16% of recent graduates were unable to find employment in nursing.

Clinical simulation has become widespread in nursing education. It is seen by schools as an important tool for standardizing clinical experiences. The importance of clinical simulation is underscored by data showing an increase in out-of-hospital clinical placements and by the majority of programs reporting that they were denied access to clinical placement sites that were previously available to them. In addition, 75.7% (n=28) of schools reported that their students had faced restrictions to specific types of clinical practice during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Expansion in RN education has required nursing programs to hire more faculty to teach the growing number of students. Although the number of nursing faculty has almost doubled in the past ten years, from 592 in 2003 to 1,076 in 2012, faculty hires have not kept pace with the growth in Los Angeles Area pre-licensure nursing programs. In 2011-2012, 73 faculty vacancies were reported. This represents a faculty vacancy rate of 6.4%, which is the highest reported rate in the region in four years.

APPENDIX A – Los Angeles Area Nursing Education Programs

ADN Programs (24)

Antelope Valley College	Los Angeles Southwest College
Cerritos College	Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
Citrus College	Los Angeles Valley College
College of the Canyons	Moorpark College
East Los Angeles College	Mount Saint Mary's College
El Camino College	Mount San Antonio College
El Camino College – Compton	Pasadena City College
Glendale Community College	Pierce College
Long Beach City College	Rio Hondo College
Los Angeles City College	Santa Monica College
Los Angeles County College of	Shepherd University
Nursing & Allied Health	Ventura College
Los Angeles Harbor College	

BSN Programs (10)

American University of Health	CSU Los Angeles
Azusa Pacific University	CSU Northridge
Biola University	Mount Saint Mary's College
CSU Channel Islands	University of California Los Angeles
CSU Long Beach	West Coast University – Los Angeles

ELM Programs (7)

Azusa Pacific University
CSU Dominguez Hills
CSU Long Beach
CSU Los Angeles
Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science
University of California Los Angeles
Western University of Health Sciences

Satellite Campus (1)

National University - BSN

APPENDIX B – BRN Education Issues Workgroup

BRN Education Issues Workgroup Members

Members	**Organization**
Loucine Huckabay, Chair	California State University, Long Beach
Audrey Berman	Samuel Merritt University
Liz Close	Sonoma State University
Brenda Fong	Community College Chancellor's Office
Patricia Girczyc	College of the Redwoods
Marilyn Herrmann	Loma Linda University
Deloras Jones	California Institute for Nursing and Health Care
Stephanie Leach	Kaiser Foundation Health Plan
Judy Martin-Holland	University of California, San Francisco
Tammy Rice	Saddleback College

Ex-Officio Member

Louise Bailey	California Board of Registered Nursing

Project Manager

Julie Campbell-Warnock	California Board of Registered Nursing